

# PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES IX<sup>1</sup>

## FOUR PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random group of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *kinti* “in order that”
2. *kevala-kappa* “(almost) entire”
3. *sakāya niruttiyā* “in/with own *nirutti*”
4. *hevaṃ* “thus”

1. *kinti* “in order that”

PED gives the meaning “how then ?” for *kinti* with only one reference for it (s.v. *kin*): *kinti te sutam*, D II 74,8. In Skt *kim* is used as a particle of interrogation, and very often it has no more meaning than a question mark. With the particle *iti* it means “why”. In the sentence quoted above (= D II 75,10 = A IV 18,21 foll.) it is simply asking a question: “Have you heard ?”

---

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies VIII”, in *JPTS*, XV, pp. 145–54.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924-48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; CP I = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vol. I, PTS 1990; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; Skt = Sanskrit; (M)RE = (Minor) Rock Edict; SepE = Separate Edict; PE = Pillar Edict; cty/cties = commentary/commentaries.

There is, however, another usage found in Pāli, which is not mentioned in PED, where it is constructed with an optative, to indicate a purpose:

*Vajjīnaṃ arahantesu dhammikārakkhāvaraṇa-gutti susaṃvihitā, kinti anāgatā ca arahanto vijitaṃ āgaccheyyūṃ*, D II 75,11 = A IV 17,5 = 20,6,10,13: “... so that arahats may enter the territory”.  
*yāvakiṇaṃ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū paccattaṃ yeva satim upaṭṭhāpessanti, kinti anāgatā ca pesalā sabrahmacārī phāsum vihareyyun ti*, D II 77,19 = A IV 22,3: “... so that good fellow-disciples may dwell at ease”.  
*kinti mahārāja idaṃ dukkhaṃ nirujjheyya aññaṃ ca dukkhaṃ na uppajjeyya*, Mil 31,29 = 65,30: “So that this *dukkha* may cease and another *dukkha* may not arise”.

The construction with an optative (or occasionally an injunctive) is also found in the Aśokan inscriptions<sup>1</sup>:

*ya ca kiṃci parākramāmi ahaṃ kiṃti bhūtānaṃ ānaṃṇaṃ gacheyam*, RE VI(L) at G: “... so that I may discharge my debt ...”.  
*ta etāya athāya ayaṃ dhammalipī lekhāpitā kiṃti ciraṃ tiṣṭeya*, RE VI(M) at G: “... so that it may last a long time”.  
*ya tu kici parikamate devānaṃpiyo priyadasi rājā ta savaṃ pāratrikāya kiṃti sakale apaparirave asa*, RE X(C) at G: “... so that there may be little danger”.  
*na tu tathā dānaṃ va pūjā va devānaṃpiyo maṃṇate yathā kiti sāravaḍhi asa*, RE XII(B) at G: “... so that there may be an increase in *sāra*”.  
*tasa tu idaṃ mūlaṃ ya vacigutī kiṃti ātpapāsamaḍapūjā va parapāsamaḍagarahā va no bhava aprakaraṇamhi*, RE XII(D) at G: “... so

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations of Aśokan site names: G = Gīrnār; Sh = Shāhbāzgarhī; Dh = Dhāuli; Rūp = Rūpnāth. I follow the sentence divisions of E. Hultzsch, *The Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford 1925.

that there should not be praise of one's own sect or blame of another's sect ...”.

*yo hi koci ātpapāsamaḍaṃ pūjayati parapāsamaḍaṃ va garahati savaṃ ātpapāsamaḍabhatiyā kiṃti ātpapāsamaḍaṃ dīpayema iti*, RE XII(H) at G: “... so that we may glorify our own sect”.

*ta samavāyo eva sādhu kiṃti aṃṇamaṃṇasa dhammaṃ sruṇāru ca susumsera ca*, RE XII(I) at G: “... so that they may hear each other's *dhamma*”.

*evaṃ hi devānaṃpiyasa ichā kiṃti savapāsamaḍā bahusrutā ca asu kalānāgamā ca*, RE XII(J) at G: “... so that all sects may be learned ...”.

*devānaṃpiyo no tathā dānaṃ va pūjaṃ va maṃṇate yathā kiṃti sāravaḍhi asa sarvapāsamaḍānaṃ*, RE XII(L) at G: “... so that there may be an increase in *sāra*”.

*anutape pi ca prabhava devanaṃpriyasa vucati teṣa kiti avatrapeyu na ca haṃṇeyasu*, RE XIII(N) at Sh: “... so that they may be ashamed and not be killed”.

*etaye cā aṭṭhaye ayi dhramadipi nipista kiti putra papotra me asu (? read anam)<sup>1</sup> navaṃ vijayaṃ ma vijetavia mañiṣu*, RE XIII(X) at Sh: “... so that they may not think of another new victory”.

*atha pajāye ichāmi hakaṃ kiṃti savena hitasukhena hidalokika-pālalokikāye yujevu ti*, SepE II(E) at Dh: “... so that they be provided with complete welfare ...”.

*ichā hi me kiṃti saṃghe samage cilathitike siyā ti*, Schism Edict (E) at Sāñcī: “... so that the *saṃgha* may be united and last a long time”.

*etāni bhaṃte dhammapaliyāyāni ichāmi kiṃti bahuke bhikhupāye cā bhikhuniye cā abhikhinaṃ suneyu cā upadhālayeyū cā*, Bhabra (E): “... so that many groups of monks and nuns may listen repeatedly ...”.  
*etiya aṭṭhaye ca sāvane kaṭe ... iya paka(me) kiti ciraṭhitike siyā*, MRE I(H) at Rūp: “... so that it may last a long time”.

<sup>1</sup> See L. Alsdorf, “Der Schluss von Aśokas dreizehntem Felsedikt”, *Mélanges d'Indianisme (à la mémoire de Louis Renou)*, Paris 1968, pp. 23–33 (p. 26).

*tesaṃ ye abhihāle vā daṃḍe vā atapatiye me kaṭe kiṃti lajūkā asvathā abhītā kaṃmāni pavatayevū ti*, PE IV(D): “ ... so that the *lajūkas* may perform their duties confidently ... ”.

*dhammayutena ca viyovadisamti janam jānapadam kiṃti hidataṃ ca pālataṃ ca ālādhayevū ti*, PE IV(E): “ ... so that they may attain this world and the next”.

*ichitaviye hi esā kiṃti viyohālasamatā ca siyā daṃḍasamatā cā*, PE IV(K): “ ... so that there may be impartiality in proceedings and in punishments”.

This is a development of the usual meaning “Why ?” Someone has done, or will do, something. Why ? That something else may or may not happen (expressed in the optative or injunctive). We may then interpret *kiṃti* as introducing the purpose clause. “(The king) has acted, so that something may happen”.

## 2. *kevala-kappa* “(almost) entire”

PED quotes (s.v. *kevala*) this compound from Sn pp. 18, 45 (mistake for 46), 125, Pj I 115 and Vv-a 124 255 with the meaning “a whole *kappa*”, and repeats this (“a whole, complete *kappa*”) with the references Sn pp. 18, 46, 125 (s.v. *kappa*).

These references are all to a stock phrase referring to a divinity illuminating a grove:

*aññatarā devatā ... kevalakappaṃ Jetavanam obhāsetvā*, Sn p. 18,10 = p. 46,14 = Khp p. 2,29 (glossed at Pj I 115,19 foll.) ≠ Sn p. 125,10 (*Brahmā Sahampati*).

*kevalakappaṃ Gijjhakūṭam cando viya suriyo viya ca obhāsentī*, Vv-a 124,11.

*devalokato āgantvā kevalakappaṃ Veḷuvanam obhāseto*, Vv-a 255,6.

This stock phrase is widely found.<sup>1</sup> Pj I 115,19 foll., Ps II 125,36 foll., Spk I 15,22 foll. and Mp II 377,2 foll. give the definition *abhisaddahana-vohāra-kāla-paññatti-chedana-vikappa-lesa-samanta-bhāv’-ādi-anekattho* for *kappa*. They quote: *kevalakappaṃ Veḷuvanam obhāsetvā ti* (Ñānamoli identifies this as S I 52,21; it would seem preferable to identify it as S I 1,10, since Buddhaghosa deals with the word at Spk I 15,22 foll. [ad S I 1,10]) *evamādisu samantabhāvo. idha pan’ assa samantabhāvo attho adhippeto. tasmā kevalakappaṃ Andhavanam ti ettha anavasesaṃ samantato Andhavanam ti evam attho daṭṭhabbo*. Mp III 353,8 (ad A III 309,4) does not give the full explanation but glosses: *kevalakappaṃ ti sakalakappaṃ*. At Mp II 374,30 (ad A I 277,2) *kevalakappaṃ* is glossed: *sakalam kappaṃ*, which is a wrong reading for *sakala-kappaṃ* (Be so). At Sp 972,2 (ad Vin I 26,3) *kevalakappaṃ* is glossed *sakalam kevalam*.

It is clear that the meaning given by PED for these references is incorrect, although Childers<sup>2</sup> had long ago seen correctly that the meaning of *kevalakappaṃ Jetavanam* was “the whole of Jetavana”, and had defined *kevalakappaṃ*<sup>3</sup> as “all, whole, entire”. Masfield points out<sup>4</sup> that this sense is not listed by PED under either *kevala* or *kappa*, and very charitably he does not say that the meaning which is given under both headings is wrong.

This failure is all the more striking because PED does list the correct meaning for *kappa* at the end of compounds (s.v. *kappa*), i.e. “made as, like, resembling”, e.g. *khagga-visāṇa-kappa* “like the rhinoceros horn”. The difficulty in the Pāli usage lies, as often in Pāli, in a Skt usage, and the solution to the problem is found by consulting

<sup>1</sup> See PTC, s.vv. *obhāseti* and *kevalakappa*.

<sup>2</sup> R.C. Childers, *Dictionary of the Pāli language*, London 1875, s.v. *kappa*.

<sup>3</sup> Childers, *ibid.*, s.v. *kevalakappa*.

<sup>4</sup> P. Masfield, *Vimāna-Stories*, PTS 1989, p. 190 (note 6).

MW,<sup>1</sup> where the meaning is given (inter alia): “having the manner, form of, similar to, like (but with a degree of inferiority), almost”, e.g. *abhedyā-kalpa* “almost impenetrable”, *prabhāta-kalpa* “nearly become light, approaching dawn”, *mṛta-kalpa* “almost dead, apparently dead”.

The meaning of *kevala-kappa* is therefore, “(almost) entire”, or “just about the whole of ...”. This meaning is given in the cties quoted above for *kevalakappā ca Aṅga-Magadhā pahūtaṃ khādaniyaṃ bhojaniyaṃ ādāya upasaṃkamissanti* (Vin I 27,28) “The whole of Aṅga and Magadha will come bringing quantities of food”, for the sense is said to be *yebhuyyātā* “for the most part”, i.e. “almost all”. They also list *kevalakappaṃ* used adverbially: *ayaṃ āyasmato Anuruddhassa Bāhiko nāma saddhivihāriko kevalakappaṃ saṃghabhedāya ṭhito* (A II 239,21), where the sense is said to be *daḷhatthatā* “firmness”.<sup>2</sup> Nāṇamoli translates “This co-resident of the venerable Anuruddha’s named Bāhika has taken his stand entirely for the schism in the Community”, and Woodward translates<sup>3</sup> “stands in every way for dissension in the Order”. Mp III 215,16 glosses: *kevalakappaṃ ti sakalaṃ samantato*.

The same meaning of *kappa* is found in the compound *ahata-kappa* which is used, in conjunction with *ahata*, of clothes: “unwashed or nearly unwashed, i.e. new or nearly new”. Miss Horner misunderstands this, and translates *ahatakappena* (Vin I 255,8) and *ahatakappānaṃ* (Vin I 290,11) “when what is allowable is unsoiled”<sup>4</sup>: Sp

<sup>1</sup> s.v. *kalpa*.

<sup>2</sup> Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, *Minor Readings and Illustrator*, PTS 1960, pp. 123–24.

<sup>3</sup> F.L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. II, PTS 1933, p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, PTS 1951, pp. 357 and 413. Miss Horner seems not to have understood the meaning of *ahata* and its reference to the Indian way of washing clothes by banging them against a rock: “not struck (against a rock), i.e. never washed, i.e. new”, and *ahata-kappa* “nearly new”. She was perhaps misled by PED’s definition of *ahata* (s.v. *hata*): “unsoiled, clean, new”.

1111,31 (ad Vin I 255,8) glosses: *ahatakappenā ti ahataśadisena ekavāraṃ vā dvikkhattuṃ vā dhotena* “like unwashed (i.e. new), washed (only) once or twice”, and Sp 1128,18 (ad Vin I 290,11) glosses: *ahatakappānaṃ ti ekavāradhotānaṃ* “washed once”. PED rightly lists the usage with *ahata* under the same meaning as for *khagga-visāṇa-kappa*, quoted above. CPD correctly translates *ahata*<sup>1</sup> as “nearly (practically) new”.

### 3. *sakāya niruttiyā* “in/with own *nirutti*”

I am still not persuaded that in the well-known passage (Vin II 139,2–16) *chandaso* means “into the Vedic language”, and consequently I do not agree with the statement, “It is hardly surprising that there was a certain pressure for using Vedic Sanskrit for the recitation of Buddhist texts from the very beginning. The Buddha objected to this, and the issue of language was felt to be important enough to require a rule in the Vinaya explicitly forbidding the use of this language for Buddhist texts in favour of the vernaculars”.<sup>2</sup> The belief that the Buddha ordered the use of vernacular languages depends upon the translation of the words *sakāya niruttiyā*. I wish to return to this problem.

I now think that I was wrong when I said in my earlier discussion of the phrase *buddhavacanāṃ chandaso āropema* that the second time *sakāya* occurs in the story it must refer to the Buddha “since there is nothing else in the sentence to refer to”.<sup>3</sup> *Sakāya* can, and indeed must, I think, refer to *Buddhavacanāṃ*. It is well-known that in the

<sup>1</sup> CPD, Vol. I, s.v. *ahata*.

<sup>2</sup> O. von Hinüber, “Origin and varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, in C. Caillat (ed.): *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris 1989, pp. 341–67 (p. 351).

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VIII”, *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda), Vol. XX, pp. 329–36 (p. 330) = CP Vol. I, pp. 122–29 (p. 122).

the common Vinaya phrase *anujānāti* means “to ordain or prescribe”.<sup>1</sup> I therefore take the Buddha’s command to mean “I ordain that the *Buddhavacana* be mastered in [or “with” — see below] its own *nirutti*”, i.e. the infinitive *pariyāpuṇitum* is used in a passive sense, and I think that those who say we must understand the word *vo* in the sentence are wrong.<sup>2</sup> Since, as I said in the same article,<sup>3</sup> it is inconceivable that *sakāya* should have two different referents, it must have the same meaning when it is used earlier.

It is clear that it cannot be the followers’ own *nirutti*. If it were, then we should have to assume that the Buddha, when informed that they were ruining (*dūśenti*) his teaching in/with/by their own *nirutti*, insisted on their using their own *nirutti*, i.e. insisted that they continue to ruin his teaching. Since he insists upon the *Buddhavacana* being mastered *sakāya niruttiyā*, the *nirutti* must also be part of what they are ruining, i.e. it is either the Buddha’s *nirutti* or the *nirutti* of the *Buddhavacana*. We can take *sakāya niruttiyā* either as locative: “The *Buddhavacana* in its own *nirutti*” or as instrumental: “The *Buddhavacana* with its own *nirutti*”. I have said elsewhere<sup>4</sup> that I prefer the idea of “gloss” for *nirutti*. By this I mean some sort of simple commentary, perhaps nothing more than a translation into the local dialect of a single word, or an etymology to make the meaning plain. On the other hand, it would appear that Buddhaghosa was taking *nirutti* as “language”, and this also makes sense: “They are spoiling the *Buddhavacana* in its own language”. Buddhaghosa identified that

<sup>1</sup> See CPD, Vol. I, s.v. *anujānāti*.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. W. Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language*, (second edition), Calcutta 1956, p. 7 footnote 2.

<sup>3</sup> Norman, *op. cit.* (in note 3 on p. 83), p. 330.

<sup>4</sup> K.R. Norman, “The dialects in which the Buddha preached”, in H. Bechert (ed.): *The Language of the earliest Buddhist tradition*, Göttingen, 1980, pp. 61–77 (pp. 61–63).

language with Māgadhi because, as I said earlier,<sup>1</sup> that was the tradition handed down in the Mahāvihāra.

#### 4. *hevaṃ* “thus”

PED s.v. *hevaṃ* gives no text references, but refers to *hi*, where it is stated that *hevaṃ* = *hi evaṃ*. Without doubt this is so in certain contexts. Where *hevaṃ* occurs as a second word in a clause, particularly after *na*, it may stand for *h(i) evaṃ*. Where it occurs as first word in a clause, it must be *hevaṃ*, since *hi*, being an enclitic, cannot stand as first word.

I have elsewhere pointed out that *hevaṃ* occurs in the Kathāvatthu,<sup>2</sup> e.g. *hevaṃ eva tattha dakkha* (Kv 3,11); *hevaṃ paṭijānantā*, *hevaṃ niggaḥetabbā* (Kv 3,15–16). It is interesting to note that another such occurrence is at D I 54,17, in the description of the views of Makkhali Gosāla: *hevaṃ* [Ee prints *h’ evaṃ*] *n’ atthi doṇa-mite sukha-dukkhe pariyanta-kaṭe saṃsāre*. Since forms with initial *h-* are frequent in the Eastern versions of the Aśokan inscriptions,<sup>3</sup> we can assume that this is a genuine Eastern dialect form, appropriate to the speaker, and therefore retained in the account of his views.

Cambridge

K.R. Norman

<sup>1</sup> Norman, *op. cit.* (in note 3 on p. 83), p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Māgadhisms in the Kathāvatthu”, in A.K. Narain (ed.): *Studies in Pali and Buddhism (a Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap)*, Delhi 1979, pp. 279–87.

<sup>3</sup> See Hultsch, *op. cit.* (in note 1 on p. 78), Index, s.vv. *hida*, *heḍisa/hedisa*, *heta*, *hemeva*, *hevaṃ*, *hesā*.